Law Offices Stewart, Stewart V Alexander Descret Bank Building Salt Lake City, Utah

SAMUEL W. STEWART BAMMAD J. STEWART BAMEL ALEXADER MARK E. WADBOUPS DAVID M. CANNON

0

Jan. 29th, 1921.

Mr. T. F. Wentz, Commercial Bank Bldg., Provo, Utah.

Doar Sir:

As por your letter of Jan. 28th we are inclosing herewith motion to modify proposed Findings and Decree in Case No. 2888. Accept our thanks for your efforts in this matter.

Very respectfully,

STEWART STEWART & ALEXANDER.

By Bamard Stewart

PJS:S Incl.

H.

Law Offices Stewart, Stewart V Alexander Deseret Bank Building Salt Lake City, Utah

SANUEL W. STEWART BARNARD J. STEWART DANIEL ALEXANDER MARK E. WADDOUPS DAVID H. CANNON

1 page 1

Jan. 25th, 1921.

Mr. F. F. Wentz, Engineer, Provo, Utah

Dear Sir:

I received a copy of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decree in the case of Provo Reservoir Company vs. Provo City, et al., Case No. 2888. I find that in the caption of the Findings and Decree the Stewart Ranch is not mentioned as a party defendant. This is an oversight evidently, because in the body of the Findings and Decree the Stewart Ranch is mentioned as one of the parties and is awarded the water to which it is entitled, When the Stewart Ranch is referred to it is referred to as the Stewart Ranch Company. "Company" should be stricken out. The name of the company is "Stewart Ranch."

In the Findings the name of Stewart Ranch appears on pp. 56, 57, 61 and 62; and in the Decree on pp. 9, 36, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46 and 48. Would you be kind enough to see that name of Stewart Ranch, a corporation, is inserted in the caption as one of the defendants and that the word "Company" is stricken out in the other places where the mame appears?

Very respectfully,

BJ3:3

Barrard Shewort

RE: PROVO RESERVOIR COMPANY
VS
PROVO CITY ET AL. CASE NO. 8868.
FOURTH DISTRICT COURT.

Attention Barnard J.Stewart:

Provo, Utah, Jan.28,1921.

Stewart, Stewart & Alexander.

Salt Lake City, Utah.

Gentlemen:

Refering to the rights of the Stewart Ranch and the corrections of the Proposed Findings and Decree in the case of Provo Reservoir Company vs. Provo City et.al., as contained in your letter of the 25th inst. I enclose herwith in duplicate motion to make such corrections.

You may make such changes in the form as you desire, and when properly eigned, return to me and I will attend to the filing in the clerks office.

Yours Very Truly.

Commissioner.